



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_10138
Title of the Manuscript:	Oxidative DNA damage in gestational diabetes mellitus: Correlation with antioxidants in an Iraqi cohort
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The word 'Impaired' should be changed with 'Elevated' or alternative words in Introduction section (line no. 10) for clear understanding. 2. As the subjects (both control and GDM mother) were taken in the gestation period of ~ 20 weeks, so these biomarkers were not measured during first trimester or early pregnancy period. That's why, it cannot be stated that, these specific biomarkers showed their efficacy for GDM diagnosis during early pregnancy. As discussion is not clearly matched with the data produced (Table-1),	We thank the reviewer for his/her help with this. I agree, I have changed the word to be "elevated". Part of the research project is to evaluate how early these markers can change during pregnancy. To be consistent in paper, I have amended the first section of the discussion and removed the "first trimester" and changed the statement to be : "This research has demonstrated the efficacy of using emerging biomarkers as a multi-marker approach to characterize GDM during pregnancy".
Minor REVISION comments	1. In Introduction section (line no. 12), should be clearly mentioned. GDM predominantly affects pregnant women at third trimester (not just after the first trimester) 2. The value of correlation coefficient ($r= 0.36$ in Figure-2, line no. 132) is relatively lower, it is expected to be higher (Figure-2) 3. Cohort size should be mentioned here clearly (line no. 155) in discussion.	I have amended this statement to be: "pregnant women predominantly at third trimester". Thank you for noticing this, I have asked our statistician to check the calculation and he confirmed what we have. The calculation was done using the Microsoft Excel Sheet and this value came automatically when we calculate the plot value. I have added the cohort size in the discussion as follow: non-significant rise of this biomarker in GDM with a much smaller cohort (8 GDM



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. In some parts of the article (i.e. discussion), language is not so standard and clear (line no. 168, 169 and 170)	participants). I have re-write this section to be as follow: "In addition, the GDM group showed a reduction in the plasma concentration of reduced GSH in comparison with the healthy pregnant mothers (Table 3). This is in accordance with the findings from other studies"
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This research article should be rechecked by the author for its better clarification.	We thanks the reviewers for their kind and valuable suggestions. the articles have been rechecked and all the changes made were highlighted in yellow for easy tracking.